



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JUNE MEETING, 1893.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 8th instant, at three o'clock, P. M.; the President, Dr. GEORGE E. ELLIS, in the chair.

After the reading of the record of the May meeting and of the list of donors to the Library during the last month, the President called attention to the new volume of Collections now ready, comprising a selection from the letters written from September, 1731, to January, 1734, by Jonathan Belcher, Governor of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, which he regarded as one of much historical and biographical interest. He also said that the Committee for publishing the third part of the Belknap Papers had printed, for insertion in that volume, a fly-leaf containing the rough draft or copy of Dr. Belknap's answer to Mr. Eliot's letter of February, 1781, printed by them.¹ Dr. Belknap's letter was not known to be in existence when the volume was published.

Mr. WILLIAM S. APPLETON said he had recently found among his family papers a manuscript copy of some verses written in 1818, on the removal of Rev. Horace Holley to the West, containing punning allusions to the ministers of Boston of that day. He did not know whether they had ever been printed, but he thought it might be well, on account of their local interest, to preserve them in the Proceedings. He also presented to the Library the copy in the writer's own hand of a letter written in May, 1820, by his father, a former member of this Society, giving a minute account of the Parodi affair.

The verses read by Mr. Appleton are as follows:—

“Hiegho! hiegho! the Holley!”
Was Willy Shakspear's cry;
Our hearts in sad response
Shall echo back the sigh.

¹ 6 Mass. Hist. Coll. vol. iv. pp. 202-208.

No more beneath its shade
 Instructed, charm'd to sit,
 Uprooted, gone, can we
 Contentedly submit?

No! *Brown May* West-ward go,
 And tell them t' is a folly
 Among their crooked sticks
 To plant our beauteous *Holley*.

"Under the *Greenwood* tree"
 Meanwhile we'll sit secure;
 For time its early blossoms
 Will ripen and mature.

On you now, trusty stewards,
 Each one of us depends
 For wholesome meat & drink,
 Air, exercise, and friends.

Whene'er we wish to ride,
 A *Palfrey* you may hire;
 And if our active limbs
 A *Walker* run require,

In fertile *Kirkland* straying
 We'll pluck the fragrant rose,
 For many a flowret there
 Beside the poppy grows.

Utensils for our table
 We wish you to prepare;
 At Cambridge may be had
 Useful the homely *Ware*.

(*Mak-Keen* our carving knife!
 We often want to use it.
 So bright its slender blade
 We hope not soon to lose it.)

For food, plain boiled and roast,
 No brimstone garnished round;
 Our glasses filled with wine,
 Our *Porter* good and sound.

No superstitious slaves
 Shall fill our minds with terror;
 A *Freeman's* steady light
 Dispels the mists of error.

We want no Charlestown pork ;
 With *Moss* their pigs they cram ;
 Nor fresh, nor salt, nor smoak'd,
 Not even a *Frothing-ham*.

Around our social fare
 No rigid *Dwights* we want,
 Nor *Sharpers* to ensnare
 [One line missing]

The mild & good tho' *Gray*
 We'll welcome with a smile,
 And if with trouble *Harass'd*,
 Sleep always free from *Guile*.

Our park so well inclosed
 No *Parkman* needs to keep it ;
 The fence is built too high
 For *Hunting-dons* to leap it.

But least you should conceit
 Old *Byles* broke out again,
 We'll our favourite toast,
 And thus conclude the strain :

May Brown and *West* continue
 Rich in grace and piety,
 And long remain the stewards
 Of Hollis Street Society.

The Hon. GEORGE S. HALE presented, in behalf of the family of the late Josiah P. Cooke, a type-written account prepared by Mr. Cooke, of the descendants of Aaron Cooke, who settled at Dorchester in 1635, and was the earliest of that name in America. Mr. Hale then read the following communication : —

What is the true name of the educational institution at Cambridge, in New England, sometimes called Harvard College, sometimes Harvard University ? It may be admitted at once that this is a purely nominal discussion, — that the College or the University would smell as sweet by any other name. But in this Society, historically, if not otherwise, we have a right to ask, like ancient Pistol, —

“Oh quality, . . . art thou a gentleman ? What is thy name ? Discuss !”

especially if we find ourselves at liberty to say,—

“Thou dost here usurp
The name thou ow'st not.”

No one can deny that a name is a mere designation, which the claimant, unless some law or right forbid, can assume or change. Mr. Smith may doubtless call himself Smythe, Kettle may rise into Kettell, Riddle into Riddell; Mr. “Bug” may win philological immortality under the nobler designation of “Norfolk Howard.” Still, in our historical trifling, it is not without its interest to inquire if this love of loftier names ever rises into the ether of universities.

The earliest trace of baptism for this infant subject of our study is the vote of the General Court of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay (October 28, O. S. 1636), by which “The Court agree to give four hundred pounds towards a School or College” (1 Qu. 586).

The next year they appointed twelve men “to take order for a College at Newtown” (now Cambridge). In March, 1638–9 (13th 1st M), it is ordered that “the College agreed upon formerly, to be built at Cambridge, shall be called Harvard College”; and in 1642 the preamble of the Act establishing the overseers of Harvard College recites that “Whereas through the good hand of God upon us there is a Colledg founded in Cambridge in the County of Middlesex called Harvard Colledg”; and throughout the Act the institution is designated as a college. The Book of the General Laws and Liberties, of 1649 (Ed. of 1660),¹ repeatedly refers to it as a “Colledg,” but further speaks (p. 139) of “rayising up Schooles of Learning and especially the Colledg,” thus designating it a “schoole,” and refers to it as a “seminary of knowledg and virtue.” But (p. 191), referring to grammar schools, it says, “the master thereof, being able to instruct youth so far as they may be fitted for the Uneversety”; while (p. 177) it exempts from keeping arms and from military exercise and service the “President, Fellows” &c. “of Harvard Colledg.” The name or title is thus at this early date clearly declared; while the general terms of “schoole” and “Uneversety”—the latter, so far as now known thus for the first time used—are em-

¹ See the Colonial Laws of Massachusetts, published by the City of Boston, 1889, p. 138.

played to represent its character as an educational institution. In 1650 the Charter of the President and Fellows of Harvard College was granted, providing that the "President and Fellows, for the time being, shall for ever hereafter, in name and fact, be one body politic and corporate in law, . . . and shall be called by the name of President and Fellows of Harvard College . . . and by that name . . . may . . . acquire . . . lands . . . sue and plead," etc; and that the said President, with any three of the Fellows, shall have power, and are hereby authorized, when they shall think fit, to make and appoint a Common Seal. The name "Harvard College" is, so far as we know, invariably used in the legislation of the Colony and Province; and this Charter with its appendix is now in force precisely as drafted. In the Charter proposed in 1692 (1 Qu. p. 596), it was provided that "The President and Fellows of the said College shall have power . . . to grant . . . degrees as in the Universities in England." In 1697 it is called an "Academy" (Acts & Resolves of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, vol. i. p. 290).

In the provincial resolve of 1707 it is designated as "That House." The next trace of the word "University" is found in the Constitution of 1780, in which Part II. chap. 5 is on "The University." Article 1 recites "the foundation of Harvard College, in which university," etc. The communication to Mr. Hollis from several worthy English pastors as to the Divinity Professorship, of August, 1721, speaks of "students upon their first coming to the University" (1 Qu. p. 536).

"House" is defined as "a college," among other things. Lyte (p. 87) says: "The early collegiate foundations . . . were sometimes described as Halls, sometimes as Houses, sometimes as Colleges." Christ Church, at Oxford, is known as the House (*ædes Christi*.) And in "Disraeli and his Day," by Sir William Fraser (p. 353), he says: "All the members of the 'House'; if you call it a College, you will be drowned in Mercury; that is Christ Church, may dine there." The title survives at Cambridge in Peterhouse.

In a memorial of the Corporation presented to the General Court in 1812, the institution is spoken of as the University. In 1762 the Overseers, in a remonstrance to Governor Bernard against the establishment of a college in Hampshire County,

declare "that there is no real difference between a College and a Collegiate School," and that our forefathers established the College with the hope that "the seminary of learning of which they then laid the foundation would at length . . . one day arrive to the dignity and extensive usefulness of a University"; and speak of "ground to hope that our College would . . . acquire all the endowments . . . of a University" (2 Qu. App. VII. 464-475).

The history by Benjamin Pierce is entitled "A History of Harvard University from its Foundation in the year 1636," and he is designated "Librarian of the University." The book is published by Brown Shattuck & Co., "Booksellers to the University," and dedicated to Paine Wingate and "the other sons of Harvard University." The preface written after his death repeats the appellation. He says (p. 3) that "in March, 1639, it was ordered that the College should be Harvard College."

"When," says Quincy, "in 1780, the framers of the Constitution of Massachusetts authorized Harvard College to assume the title of 'University,' it comprised, strictly speaking, but one school, the Academic or 'School of the Arts'" (2 Qu. 258). A proviso is annexed to this article [chap. 5, art. 3], reserving to the Legislature of the Commonwealth the power "of making such alterations in the government of the said University as shall be conducive to its advantage and the interest of the republic of letters, in as full a manner as might have been done by the Legislature of the late Province of Massachusetts Bay."

The Constitution, in the second section of the same chapter, makes it "the duty of legislatures and magistrates, in all future periods of this Commonwealth, to cherish the interests of literature and the sciences, and all seminaries of them, especially the University at Cambridge, public schools and grammar schools in the towns." "The indiscriminate use of the terms 'College' and 'University' in the Constitution of the Commonwealth was considered as sanctioning the latter designation, which has ever since been applied to this institution, except in such legal instruments as require its corporate name for their validity" (2 Qu. 176).

It is hazardous to allege a negative; but it is not known that the designation "Harvard University" has ever been used in

any legislation, or that of "University," except in the instances above stated. The present Annual Catalogue "published by the University" states that Harvard University comprehends the following departments: Harvard College, the Divinity School, the Lawrence Scientific School, the Graduate School, the Law School, etc., naming sixteen departments in all; and states that the Peabody Museum, etc., "is a constituent part of the University"; that the Treasurer has the custody of all the property of the University, while the phrase "University property" is used. It appears that the appellations "Harvard University," "Harvard College," "The University at Cambridge," respectively appear on the titlepages of the catalogues and reports of the Presidents since 1825, as follows:

Harvard College :	Harvard University :
Reports for 1848-49 to 1891-92.	Reports for 1825-26 to 1845-46.
Catalogues for 1849-50 to 1852-53.	Catalogues for 1827-28 to 1845-46 ; 1853-54 to 1892-93.
The University at Cambridge :	The University in Cambridge:
Reports for 1846-47 and 1847-48.	Catalogues of 1825 and 1826.
Catalogues for 1846-47 to 1848-49.	

The President, in the reports, apparently is generally, if not always, "of the University." Kirkland and Quincy say "Harvard University," Sparks, Felton, Walker, Hill, "Harvard College," in the catalogues under their respective authority. Sparks only adheres to the term "College," and the others have "Harvard University" and "The University at or in Cambridge."

The seal of the College seems naturally connected with its name or title. The original Charter empowers the President and any three of the Fellows, "when they shall think fit, to make and appoint a Common Seal for the use of the said Corporation." This, it may be observed, is not the frequent phrase "to make, break, and alter"; but, without inquiry whether it allows variations in the Seal from time to time, we find that on the 27th "of the 10th month of 1643 it is ordered that there shall be a Colledge Seale in forme following" (1 Qu. p. 49). "Veritas" was soon exchanged for "In Christi Glo-

riam." In Increase Mather's presidency there is reason to believe that the motto now in use, "Christo et Ecclesiæ," was substituted. There is no authority for either in any existing college record, nor is it known to a certainty when either was introduced. We find a reference (1 Qu. 474) to "Mr. Newman's proposal about procuring the college arms at Bilboa," at a meeting of June 11, 1694.

The word "Academia" is apparently used to express "University" as distinct from "College," since it is substituted for "Collegium." It is perhaps presumptuous even to ask, not what authority there is for their use, but how "Academia" is made more appropriate than "Collegium" or "Universitas."¹

In 1885 (June 8) a form was adopted by the Corporation as the proper form of the College Seal, and as a substitute for the various forms of the Seal then in use, described as follows: Arms, gules; three open books, argent; edges, covers and clasps, or; on the books the letters Ve-ri-tas, sable. The Seal contains a shield with the arms placed on a circular field, or, on which are the words "Christo et Ecclesiæ," azure, and around the words "Sigillum Academiæ Harvardianæ, Nov Ang."

What, then, is a university? Once and originally it meant the whole or complete thing. Wielif uses it in the sense of "world." Ducange defines it, "the collective inhabitants of a city or town." Skeat has "University, a school for universal knowledge." Worcester considers it to mean, in this connection, "a seminary of the highest class, where various branches of literature and science, and sometimes theology, law, and medicine, are taught, and degrees conferred." The new American Cyclopaedia, after a full account of the early and foreign universities, declares "that in the United States there are, properly speaking, no universities."

"Voluntary associations," says Lyte in his "History of the University of Oxford" (p. 4), "were, before long, formed at both places [Paris and Bologna], for the purpose of securing uniformity of discipline, and defending the common interests of teachers and pupils; and associations of this kind came to be known as *studia*, and eventually as *universitates*."

"The true meaning of the term University is frequently misunderstood. According to some, a university is a place at which all the arts

¹ Newman. The Idea of a University, xiii.

and sciences are taught; according to others, it is a collection of semi-independent colleges of students. Neither of these definitions, however, will stand the test of history, for there have been great and learned universities neither professing to impart universal knowledge, nor boasting a single affiliated college. Indeed in the earliest and broadest sense of the term, a university had no necessary connection with schools or literature, being merely a community of individuals bound together by some more or less acknowledged tie. Regarded collectively in this light, the inhabitants of any particular town might be said to constitute a university, and in point of fact the Commonalty of the townsmen of Oxford was sometimes described as a university in formal documents of the Middle Ages. The term was, however, specially applied to the whole body of persons frequenting the schools of a large *studium*. Ultimately it came to be employed in a technical sense as synonymous with *studium*, to denote the institution itself. This last use of the term seems to be of English origin, for the University of Oxford is mentioned as such in writs and ordinances of the years 1238, 1240, and 1253, whereas the greater seat of learning on the banks of the Seine was, until the year 1263, styled 'the University of the Masters,' or 'the University of the Scholars,' of Paris."

We learn from the Report of the United States Commissioner for Education for 1884-85 (p. 584), that there were then over one hundred and twenty universities in the United States, not including Harvard and Yale, which there bear the modest title of Colleges. In New England there were twelve colleges, — Amherst, Boston, Bowdoin, Bates, College of the Holy Cross, Dartmouth, Harvard, Middlebury, Trinity, Tufts, Williams, and Yale; and five Universities, — Boston, Brown, Colby, University of Vermont, and Wesleyan. We must now enroll Harvard with the more dignified institutions, such as the Little Rock, the Lombard, the Lake Forrest, the Lincoln, the DePauw (late Asbury) the Butler, the Drake, the Baker, the Highland, the Lane, the Ottawa, the Central, the Leland, the Hamline, the Straight, the Rust, the Alfred, the Sedalia, the Ingham, the Biddle, the Shaw, the Baldwin, the Vanderbilt, the Allen, the Fisk, the Dennison, the Baylor, the Lawrence, the Howard, the Urbana, the Furman, the Fisk, besides any which bear the local and lofty names of States.

An English observer of American schools avers that "the conception of a university as an organization apart from a college, and entitled to apply a uniform and impartial test to

students who have been taught under different conditions, does not exist in America.”¹

Paris has its university; France its college, the College of France, — “an institution” which it has been said “now occupies a unique position in the world,” and “represents in the highest degree the aristocracy of learning,” — the oldest college in that country, with such names as Lalande, Cuvier, Cousin, Biot, De Sacy, Lacroix, Say, Champollion, Michelet, Bartholémy, St. Hilaire, Sainte-Beuve, Renan,² — Is not the name it bears noble and lofty enough for our Alma Mater, Fair Harvard?

It is not yet seven years since, in November, 1886, James Russell Lowell told us, in his address on the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the foundation of Harvard College: “It has been mainly during the last twenty-five years that the College, having already the name but by no means all the resources of a university, has been trying to perform some at least of the functions which that title implies.” “But,” he says, “we still mainly occupy the position of a German Gymnasium.”

The late Dean of the Medical School at Harvard declares:—

“It is evident, therefore, that Harvard cannot be styled a university in the sense in which the term is used in any European country. It may, of course, be maintained that we are not bound to follow other nations in our use of language, and that the American is quite as much entitled as the German or the Englishman to have his own idea of what is meant by a University. This view would be entitled to more consideration if any well-established American usage existed, or even if there were any prospect of establishing such a usage.

“It must, moreover, be admitted that, in the interest of clear thinking, it is undesirable that the same term should be used with different significations, even when those using it belong to different nations; and if it can be further shown that the changes in Harvard College which have been supposed to justify its designation as a University are chiefly changes of degree and not of kind, it will be evident that the use of the word in connection with our Alma Mater can scarcely be justified. . . . It must, therefore, be admitted that our Alma Mater has,

¹ Notes on American Schools and Training Colleges, by J. G. Fitch, M.A., LL.D., one of her Majesty's Chief Inspectors of Training Colleges, 1890, p. 112.

² Frederic Carrel, in the “Fortnightly Review.”

in her recent remarkable development, really furnished no sufficient reason for styling her a University.”¹

An effort has been lately made to make a congeries of separate departments by uniting Harvard College with others. Under its recent action no such institution is recognized as entitled to a separate faculty, even in the humble form of what is sometimes called the Undergraduate Department. The Catalogue of 1893 states that “Harvard University comprehends the following departments: Harvard College,” etc., sixteen in all besides the Peabody Museum; but what constitutes Harvard College is not there stated, although much is said about it. The new statutes have created a new species as the result of the academic struggle, called the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. By that statute (adopted May, 1890) Harvard College has lost its independent existence. Formerly there was a Harvard College Faculty. Harvard University still comprehends Harvard College as one of its sixteen or seventeen departments, but with a Veterinary School, a Garden, and a Herbarium; while Harvard College and the Lawrence Scientific School and the Graduate School are together under the charge of a “Faculty of Arts and Sciences.” Each of the other schools has its separate faculty. The college library is one of thirty libraries — *nunc majora canemus* — under the name of the University Library; and the Academic Council has grown into the University Council. “The term ‘faculty,’ which . . . originally signified the capacity to treat a particular subject, came to be applied technically to the subject itself or to the authorized teachers of it, viewed collectively” (Lyte, p. 7). That all the arts and sciences are taught in the College and the Scientific and Graduate Schools, can hardly be asserted.

All this involves a painful and protracted substitute for old familiar phrases. The College Faculty is merged in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The Alumnus of the College is the foster child of a faculty of numerous learned fosterers. The Alma Mater, around which gathered so many poetical associations, disappears like the “fair humanities of old religion, the power, the beauty, and the majesty, that had their haunts in” these classic shades. As Lowell says, “It is the College

¹ The Harvard Monthly, January, 1890.

that we love, and of which we are proud." Our sons no longer go to college, but to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences; and "Fair Harvard" wears spectacles and gray hairs. "Why," some historical student of graver matters asks, — "why all this trifling criticism? If it be a question of words and names and of your law, look ye to it: I will be no judge of such matters." It is not wholly a question of "words and names." One of the "English traits" of which, as Englishmen by race, we may be justly proud, is the faithful adherence to some name or appellation which the honorable history or usage of some great institution has dignified and distinguished. One of the weaknesses of Americans, which the members of such a society as this appreciate and would gladly see disappear, is the love and assumption of lofty titles, — our Sir Knights and Commanders, our Grands and Supreme Grands, our Past and Perpetual Masters. As Emerson says, "some of them [the English] are too old and too proud to wear titles, or, as Sheridan said of Coke, 'disdain to hide their heads in a coronet.'" "The names are excellent, an atmosphere of legendary melody spread over the land, . . . a sincerity and use in naming very striking to an American, whose country is whitewashed all over by unmeaning names. . . . But the English are those barbarians of Iamblichus who 'are stable in their manners, and firmly continue to employ the same words, which also are dear to the gods'" (vol. v. pp. 171, 172).

Why need Harvard College desire a loftier name, or claim an appellation of which it might without loss of dignity be destitute? "Affectation," says Dr. Johnson, "is to be always distinguished from hypocrisy, as being the art of counterfeiting those qualities which we might with innocence and safety be known to want."¹

Cardinal Newman, in "The Idea of a University," considers it as "a place of *teaching* universal *knowledge*" (p. ix). "Such universality," he says, "is considered, by writers on the subject, to be the very characteristic of a university, as contrasted with other seats of learning"; and he quotes from Mosheim, that the School of Paris "was the first to embrace all the arts and sciences, and therefore first became a university" (p. 20). But he supposes that "the *prima facie* view which the public at large would take of a univer-

¹ The Rambler, No. 20.

sity, considering it as a place of education, is nothing more or less than a place for acquiring a great deal of knowledge on a great many subjects" (p. 127).

In this latter sense the institution at Cambridge and many others which exist under that name in the United States are entitled to it; but the authorities at that place doubtless mean to claim something more. Nor would they be content to admit that while intellectual education is the function of a university, all institutions which can give intellectual education are universities. A mere examination shop for certain branches — what Disraeli called "the mechanical mediocrity of an examining board" — or a large crowd of colliding students, whatever sparks of intellectual fire may be elicited by the collision, is not Newman's university; nor does a mere collection of isolated country shops of education fulfil that great thinker's conception. They must run into and complete each other, and form a whole or system.

When the Professor at the University of Bruges proposed to discuss with any competitor "*in omni scibili et de quolibet ente,*" and fell before the inquiry of Sir Thomas More, "*Utrum averia carucae capta in vetito namio sunt irreplegibilia*" (2. Bl. Comm. 148, note), Bruges ceased to be a university, if knowledge and instruction "*in omni scibili*" is the sole test.

Certainly an institution which declines to admit to equal privileges one half of the human race, or to allow that half to demonstrate its capacity, on equal terms and with equal opportunities, to acquire the knowledge which such an institution offers to communicate to the world, as successfully as the other half, has little right to assume a title which declares its universality, whatever justification it may have to offer for its limitations and incompleteness. The terse inscription beneath the meditative and mourning statue of a New England youth, a descendant of one of the early Presidents of the Institution endowed by John Harvard, who now turns his stony back upon the noble memorial of the sons of the College, must yield to some forlorn "*Hic jacet,*" to commemorate its extinction and the birth of a name which adds to the glory of the past, — "*Nominis umbram.*"

Mr. Hale's paper was followed by brief remarks from the PRESIDENT, Mr. JUSTIN WINSOR, Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN,

and Mr. CHARLES C. SMITH, who all expressed doubts as to some of the points discussed by the writer. Dr. GREEN's remarks were in substance as follows : —

Very often names are a growth and not a creation, and this fact seems to fit the present case. The term University, as commonly applied to Harvard College, goes back, at least, to the time of the adoption of the State constitution. The designation is found in that instrument, and the framers then knew what the word meant. Before that period the authorities, on the Catalogues of the institution, had always used the term Harvard College, but immediately afterward they began to use Harvard University ; and from that time till the present this designation has been printed on the titlepage of the Triennial or Quinquennial Catalogues. It would seem as if a title, borne by the College for more than a century, ought not to be questioned at this late day.

The present name of the Harvard Medical School is not the official designation given at the outset, but has grown up from long usage. In the early part of its history it was called the Medical Institution of Harvard College, though somewhat later it is spoken of as the Medical School of Harvard College or of Harvard University. Occasionally it is mentioned in the newspapers of the period as the Boston Medical School ; and since its removal from Cambridge it is sometimes called the Massachusetts Medical College. It is only in recent times, perhaps within forty years, that the institution has been called the Harvard Medical School ; and no one now questions its right to the name.

Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN then said : —

Since our last meeting I have attended, as a delegate from this Society, the celebration of the One-hundred and Fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia ; and it seems proper for me to make a brief report. The exercises began on Monday evening, May 22, with a reception by the members in the Society's rooms, and with an address of welcome by the venerable president, Hon. Frederick Fraley, LL.D., and were continued through the four following days. On Tuesday President Fraley delivered an address, in which he reviewed the advance of science during

the past century and a half. In the forenoon of the other days papers were read; and in the afternoon excursions were made to various places of interest, including the Drexel Institute, Girard College, the University of Pennsylvania, and the extensive shipyards of William Cramp and Sons, on the Delaware River.

The proceedings of the whole celebration were appropriate and instructive, and marked by an entire absence of needless formality. One of the most interesting features of the occasion was the personality of the presiding officer, who is in the ninetieth year of his age. The dignity and readiness which he displayed when in the chair, were often the subject of complimentary remarks among the visiting delegates.

While in Philadelphia I visited the rooms of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, where I received many attentions from Mr. Frederick D. Stone, the librarian. He showed me two folio volumes of broadsides, for the most part printed in Boston, and many of them of the last century, which had great interest. Among them is a Carrier's Address, dated January 1, 1796, and relating to our Society, of which a copy is given on the next page. The fourth volume of the Collections was published complete near the beginning of 1796, having been issued in quarterly parts; and the Address was undoubtedly carried round on the appearance of the last one of these parts. This broadside adds another title to the Centennial Bibliography of the Society, printed in the Proceedings (second series, VI. 203-249); and I am inclined to think that it was written by a member, perhaps James Sullivan, at that time our President.

[In the original a Spread Eagle appears here.]

The CARRIER OF THE
 COLLECTIONS
 OF THE
 MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY,

To its LIBERAL and GENEROUS Patrons:

The various comforts of the changeful year,
 In situation snug, have oft been sung;
 Spring, summer, autumn, elevate and cheer,
 And furnish charms to grace the poet's tongue:
 But chilling *winter*, riding on the storm,
 Half froze, I sing unto my trembling lyre;
 With scarce enough to keep my body warm,
 Or where-withal to feed the kitchen fire.
 Although *December* keen, has blown his blast,
 Yet *Januarius* the same trumpet blows;
 He's froze the brooks, and all the riv'lets fast,
 And painted blue your humble servant's nose.
 Bless'd is our land, above all others bless'd!
 No haughty *lord*, here tramples down the poor;
 No odious rites by superstition dress'd,
 Nor furious *soldier* bursts your sacred door.
 The cultur'd field exuberant blessings brings;
 In chains of gold, our world's by commerce bound;
 The *printing-press* supplies the arts with wings,
Humanity consummates our renown.
 When *Anarch's* sons, their threat'ning efforts try,
 To mar the beauteous temple of the laws;
 On WASHINGTON, secure, we cast an eye,
 And *candour*, universal, shouts applause.
 A small reward, is all I shiv'ring ask,
 (I wish I'd something better still, to say,
 But must resign, with grief, the pleasing task)
 And your petitioner will ever pray,
 That joy substantial, may your steps attend,
 And calm content your happiness increase;
 Your scenes of pleasure, may they know no end —
 And all your paths be paths of perfect peace.

BOSTON, *January 1, 1796.*

Mr. HAMILTON A. HILL inquired about the significance of certain initials on one of the corner-stones of the Old South Meeting-house, in Milk Street, and spoke substantially as follows :—

Passing up or down Milk Street, one may read on the corner-stone of the Old South Meeting-house the inscription, "N. E. March 31, 1729." Dr. Wisner mentions this in his History ; and he says, further, that the letters "S. S." were cut upon a stone at the northwestern corner of the meeting-house, and that the inscription "L. B. 1729," was to be seen in his day on a stone at the northeastern corner.

The letters "S. S." undoubtedly stand for "Samuel Sewall." The Judge was the oldest member and the most distinguished man in the South Church, when its first meeting-house was taken down and the new one reared. It is true that he was much opposed to the change ; but he yielded gracefully, when he saw that the majority in the church was against him, and we can imagine that he would become interested in the undertaking as the work went forward. He himself tells us that his initials were cut into one of the corner-stones of the building which we know as the Old State House : "Monday May 5th [1712] I lay a stone at the South-east corner of the Town-House and had engraven on it S. S. 1712." There is every reason to think that the initials on the northwest corner of the Old South Meeting-house are his also.

Coming to the northeast corner, the letters which Dr. Wisner read as "L. B." may be "L. B." the letter "J" being turned to the right instead of, as usually, to the left ; or, what is more probable, they are "I. B." with a cut or scratch in the stone to the right of the letter "I." In either case they stand for Joshua Blanchard ; and they have been deciphered and identified, and the corner-stone on which they appear has been photographed, by Mr. Edward Wheelwright, a descendant of Mr. Blanchard. Joshua Blanchard was a mason, and worked upon the new building ; in "His Book," now in the possession of Mr. Wheelwright, he wrote : "1729 Aprill the 1th I with other layed the foundation of the South Brick meeting house and finished the Brick work y^e 8th of October following."

Joshua Blanchard was born in 1692, and died in 1748. He was one of the assessors of Boston from 1734 until his death,

and he served on several important committees. In 1740, September 2, he presented "a plan" to the selectmen "from Peter Faneuil Esq^r of a House for a market to be built on Dock Square (Agreeable to his Proposal to the Town at their Meeting on Monday the 14th of July last, and their Votes thereon) Desiring the Selectmen would lay out the Ground in order to begin the Foundation," which they accordingly did. He built several of the tombs in the Granary Burying-Ground, and one of them was assigned to him for his own use; it can be seen from Tremont Street, and bears his name.

The stone on the southwest corner of the meeting-house is really the foundation stone of the building, and the initials upon it, "N. E.," have been the occasion of much conjecture. Assuming that they stand for a name, like the others mentioned, an effort has been made to identify them with some one connected with the church or building, who for any reason was entitled to such permanent recognition; but thus far without success. I desire now to present the suggestion of my friend Mr. Wheelwright, that these letters may stand for Nathanael Emmes. The names of Nathanael and Samuel Emmes appear in an old account book of the West Church, "the church in Lynd Street"; the former charging for work done on the Rev. Mr. Hooper's "steps" in 1740, and on his "harth" in 1745, and the latter "for mending the Tung of y^e Bell" in 1739, and "for hanging the Bell" in 1741. Nathanael Emmes was a mason, and it is quite possible that he was the "other" mentioned by Joshua Blanchard as his co-worker on the walls of the new meeting-house; but there is a difficulty in supposing that he was the person to be commemorated by the letters in question. In the records of the town and of the selectmen, in which both Emmes and Blanchard are mentioned, Blanchard would seem to have been decidedly the more influential man of the two. On the 31st of October, 1715, "Mr. — Emmes Stone Cutter" was required to remove forthwith and carry away the stones with which he had encumbered the highway in Cornhill. On the 29th of March, 1725, liberty was given to Nathanael Emmes to take up the pavement and dig up the ground, for the purpose of laying a drain from his cellar to the "common shore in Prince Street." There is no evidence that Emmes was a prominent man in his trade, or that he was

the principal builder of the new meeting-house ; and it would seem, therefore, altogether unlikely that his initials would be graven conspicuously upon the principal corner-stone. The tradition is that the meeting-house was built by George Robert Twells or Twelves.

Another suggestion in reference to the letters "N. E.," made by one or two members of this Society, is that they stand for "Newly Erected" or "New Edifice." One objection to this explanation is that they are followed by the specific date "March 31, 1729," and it could hardly be said that the new building was erected on that day. Again, the letters on the two northern corners are known, or believed, to represent names ; and the inference is a fair one that those in the inscription on the most prominent corner do the same.

At a meeting of this Society several months ago, the question was raised whether the names Emmes and Emmons, as they appear in the records of two hundred years ago, might not be the same. An examination of the baptismal records of the Third or Old South Church shows that the two names are quite distinct, although sometimes coupled with the same Christian names. I offer for publication the following extracts from the Old South register : —

1689/90	Feb. 9.	Samuel of Benj ⁿ Emons.
	Mch. 16.	Benjamin of Benj ⁿ & Mary Ems.
1691	Aug. 9.	Benjamin of Benj ⁿ & Mary Ems.
1693	June 25.	Benjamin of Benj ⁿ & Mary Ems.
	Nov. 12.	Elizabeth of Benj ⁿ Emons.
1694/5	Mch. 3.	Mary of Benj ⁿ Emons.
1696/7	Mch. 7.	Martha of Benj ⁿ Emons.
1699	July 16.	Nathanael of Nath ^l Emons.
1700	June 30.	Samuel of Benj ⁿ Emons.
	Nov. 3.	Mary of Benj ⁿ Emons Jr.
1702	Apl. 5.	Hannah of Nath ^l Emons.
1703	Dec. 5.	Nathanael of Nath ^l Emons.
1705	Oct. 14.	Jacob of Nath ^l Emons.
1729	Mch. 30.	Hannah of Thomas & Hannah Emmons.

The name of Nathanael Emmes is not to be found in the Old South registers. Nathanael Emmons owned the covenant July 16, 1699, the day on which his first son, Nathanael, was baptized, and he became a member of the church in full communion in 1713. His second son, also Nathanael, became one of the early portrait-painters in Boston, and died in 1740. The name is spelled variously in the church records : Emins, Emons, Emonds, and Emmons.

Mr. ARTHUR B. ELLIS presented a photograph of the first page of the records of the First Church in Boston, containing the original church covenant, which is still in use by that church more than two hundred and sixty years after its first adoption. It bears the names of Winthrop, Dudley, and other prominent men; but all the signatures are in the handwriting of the minister, Rev. John Wilson. In answer to inquiries, Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN said that he had in his possession the record book of the First Church in Salem; and Mr. A. C. GOODELL, Jr., said that at Plymouth the minister wrote the names appended to the church covenant, and he thought it was also done in other places.

Mr. A. C. GOODELL, Jr., made some extemporaneous remarks on the history of the law as to the censorship of the press in Massachusetts, in substance as follows:—

As is well known, in its infancy the art of printing was deemed, both on the Continent of Europe and in England, properly within the control of government, or, as Blackstone expresses it, “a matter of state, and subject to the coercion of the crown.” In England, originally, this control was a function of the royal prerogative, and hence in time it came to be regulated by decrees of the Court of Star-Chamber limiting the number of printers and presses and prohibiting unlicensed publications.

During the Revolution and the Commonwealth both houses of Parliament continued this supervision and control, and passed sundry orders for suppressing “great abuses and frequent disorders” in printing and publishing. The earlier orders proving ineffectual, sundry ordinances (in 1643, 1647, 1649, and 1652) were passed, based upon the Star-Chamber decree of 1637. After the Restoration these ordinances were incorporated in the Statute of 13 and 14 Car. II., chap. 33, which, with some intermissions, remained for about thirty-two years the law of England. This Statute, which expired by its own limitation in 1679, was revived in 1685 by the Statute 1 Jac. II., chap. 17, which in turn expired in 1692; but it was continued for two years by the Statute 4 W. and M., chap. 24. After its final expiration strenuous efforts were made to revive this act, but failed; and so “the liberty of the press” in England may be said not to have become established until 1694 or

1695. This exemption from censorship, however, did not extend to the setting up of printing-presses and conducting the business of printing, which in England to this day continue subjects of legislative interference and regulation.

These acts of Parliament were evidently operative only within the realm; for though the Statute of 13 and 14 Car. II. expressly forbade the printing of the prohibited books, etc., in any of the king's dominions, the whole tenor of the Act indicates that the sole purpose of this clause was to prevent inhabitants of the realm from carrying on abroad a business which was forbidden at home. It is a noticeable coincidence, however, that in the same year (October, 1662), the legislature of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, where previously the press had been absolutely free from censorship, ordered that no "copie" should be printed but by the allowance first had and obtained under the hands of Capt. Daniel Gookin and Mr. Jonathan Mitchell. Although this order was repealed the next year, it was followed, in October, 1664, by another order forbidding the setting up a press in any place other than Cambridge, and reviving the censorship of the press, which for that year was entrusted to the President of Harvard College, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Jonathan Mitchell, and Mr. Thomas Shepard, or any two of them.¹

In 1672, upon the petition of John Usher, the General Court of the Colony passed an order restraining printers from imprinting on their own account a larger number of books, etc., than had been ordered by the publishers; and two years later the restriction of the use of the printing-press to the town of Cambridge being removed, Rev. Thomas Thacher and Mr.

¹ That the General Court did not wholly relinquish to its chosen censors its watchfulness to prevent the dissemination of pernicious literature, is shown by the following entry in the Colony Records:—

" 1669. ~~~~~ 19 May Tho. a Kempis booke to be re- vised, &c.	The Court being informed that there is now in the presse, reprinting, a booke, tit Imitaçons of Christ, or to yt purpose, written by Thomas a Kempis, a Popish minister, wherein is conteyned some things that are less safe to be infused among the people of this place, doe comend it to the licensers of the press, the more full revisall thereof, & that in the meane tyme there be no further progresse in that worke." — Vol. iv. part ii. p. 424.
--	---

Upon this, Hutchinson remarks: "In a constitution less popular this would have been thought too great an abridgment of the subject's liberty." — *Hist. Mass.* (1st ed.), vol. i. p. 258.

Increase Mather, of Boston, were added to the board of censors previously appointed. This, undoubtedly, was in view of the setting up of a press in Boston by the first Boston printer, John Foster. Upon the decease of Foster, in 1681, Samuel Sewall succeeded to the management of this press under authority derived immediately from the General Court, which ordered that no other person be allowed a similar privilege "without the like liberty being first granted." Sewall resigned this office in 1684, just before the government of the Colony ceased under the first charter.

Dudley, first President of the Council under the new régime of the Territory and Dominion of New England, appears not to have received any special direction concerning the licensing of printing-presses or the printing of books; but the fifty-seventh article of the first draught of instructions to the Governor, Sir Edmund Andros, who arrived a few months later, ran as follows:—

"And forasmuch as great inconvenience may arise by the liberty of printing within our said territory under your government you are to provide by all necessary orders that no person keep any printing-press for printing, nor that any book pamphlet or other matters whatsoever be printed without your especial leave and license first obtained."¹

This instruction, deriving its force from the royal prerogative² (the full operation of which in the dominions of the Crown had not been curtailed by Parliament), was renewed to the earlier governors of the Province. It constituted, substantially, the thirty-fifth article of Phips's instructions; the forty-second of Bellomont's; the sixty-eighth of Dudley's, and the seventy-third of Burges's, Shute's, and Burnet's, respectively. This last, issued in 1728, was the last direction for the exercise of this authority by any governor in Massachusetts; and therefore, from the assumption of the gubernatorial office by Belcher in 1730, must be dated the restoration of the ancient liberty of printing enjoyed by the first generation of colonists.

¹ This instruction is taken by permission of The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, from the second volume of their publications, now in press.

² "One of the first acts of power, after the change of government, was the restraint of the press. Randolph was the licenser. There was not so much room to complain of this proceeding as if the press had been at liberty before. It only changed its keeper, having been long under restraint during the former administration." — HUTCHINSON, *ut supra*, p. 355.

Remarks, incidental to the subjects under discussion, were also made during the meeting, by the Hon. GEORGE F. HOAR, the Hon. MELLEN CHAMBERLAIN, Rev. Dr. EDMUND F. SLAFTER, and Mr. ROBERT C. WINTHROP, Jr.

Mr. Barrett Wendell, Assistant Professor of English at Cambridge, was elected a Resident Member.

It was Voted, to omit the monthly meetings in July, August, and September ; the President and Secretary being authorized to call a special meeting, if desirable.